R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 814 RC 002 138

NEW MEXICO TITLE I, P.L. 89-10, ESEA PROJECTS, 1966-1967. ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT.

BY- GARCIA, ISAAC MANZANARES, JESSE
NEW MEXICO STATE DEPT. OF EDUCATION, SANTA FE

PUB DATE 1 DEC 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.76 42P.

DESCRIPTORS- COMPENSATORY EDUCATION, *COMPENSATORY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, DISADVANTAGED GROUPS, *DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, *EDUCATIONALLY DISADVANTAGED, SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED, ESEA TITLE 1,

TITLE I FUNDS TO THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO PROVIDE COMPENSATORY EDUCATION FOR APPROXIMATELY ONE-FIFTH OF THE STUDENTS ENROLLED IN PUBLIC AND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS. EIGHTY-EIGHT PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS RECEIVE FUNDS FOR PROGRAMS WHICH AID IN REDUCING THE NUMBER OF DROPOUTS, IMPROVING READING, INCREASING MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE ACHIEVEMENT, BETTERING INSTRUCTIONAL AND SERVICE AREAS OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, AND INITIATING HEALTH, GUIDANCE, AND LIBRARY SERVICES. THREE CHARTS RELATE THE ALLOCATIONS TO THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND 17 CHARTS PRESENT DATA ILLUSTRATING THE SUCCESS OF THE FUNDED PROGRAMS. (JH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED015814

RECEIVED
JAN 12 1968
E.R.I.C.

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

1966 - 1967

TITLE I

P . L . 89 - 10

ESEA PROJECTS

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

STATE ANNUAL EVALUATION
FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967
P.L. 89-10, Title I

Prepared by: Isaac Garcia, Specialist
Program Development (Evaluation)

Submitted by: Dr. Mildred Fitzpatrick, Chairman
Title I ESEA Services

Funds authorized by Public Law 89-10, Title I ESEA to the State of New Mexico are providing compensatory education for approximately one-fifth of the students enrolled in public and non-public schools in our state. This segment of the student population has been categorized as educationally deprived and, consequently, is in need of special educational assistance. These students are participating in Title I projects which are designed to assist them in raising their level of educational attainment to that which is appropriate for children of their respective age groups.

Public Law 89-10, Title I, Section 205 (a) requires that every local educational agency in the State participating in this program evaluate the effectiveness of every instructional and service area in operation. Section 205 (a) also compels the local school districts to make interim and/or annual reports to the State Educational Agency.

Title I ESEA Services submitted to the Director of the Division of Compensatory Education in Washington, D.C. a State Annual Evaluation Report for Fiscal Year 1967 (see attached) that includes an analysis of Title I activities carried out in the eighty-nine public school districts in New Mexico who are receiving funds under P.L. 89-10, Title I.

Since each item in the Annual Report is a direct response to identically numbered items in the U.S.O.E. format for the State Annual Evaluation Report, this Supplementary Report containing additional, pertinent and conclusive statements on successes of Title I projects is hereby submitted.

Improvements in attitude, motivation in going to school and self-confidence at the secondary level were reflected in a 4.5 per cent increase of students continuing their education beyond the high school level. This was not characteristic of the non-Title I schools, in fact an actual percentage decline occurred in these schools. Improvements in attitude, motivation and self-confidence were also reflected in a decrease of dropouts from 29 per cent to 27 per cent.

On pretest - posttest comparisons of an appropriate sample, academic achievement in reading was reflected by a 13 per cent decrease in the number of students scoring in the lower quartile or the 25th percentile and below (national norms). The above sample was taken from a population of 31,529 students in reading projects.

On pretest - posttest comparisons of an appropriate sample, academic achievement in math was reflected in a 39 per cent decrease in the number of students scoring in the lower quartile or the 25th percentile and below (national norms). The above sample was taken from a population of 9,005 students in math projects.

On pretest - posttest comparisons of an appropriate sample, academic achievement in science was reflected in a 27 per cent decrease in the number of students scoring in the lower quartile or the 25th percentile and below (national norms). The above sample was taken from a population of 1,386 students in science projects.

Achievement gains in most instructional and service areas were generally more significant at the elementary level rather than the secondary level.

Achievement gains were noted in the large or medium size schools, but not necessarily in the small schools where comprehensive supportive services were limited.

A combination of activities rather than a single activity proved more effective in overcoming educational deficiencies on the part of the students in Title I projects. For example, a reading program supported by guidance, library service, health service, etc., proved to be more effective than a reading program without these services.

Reports indicated that over 5,000 students in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd grades were retained last year throughout the State.

Pre-school or Head Start children in the first grade last year generally showed a much lower absenteeism rate, a much lower retention rate and achievement gains were indeed more significant.

A high percentage of students were retained in the 10th and 11th grades last year. A high percentage of students also dropped out of school from these two grade levels. Some minor gains have been reported in these areas. Remediation programs apparently are not generally successful in the 10th and 11th grades.

STATE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT

FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

P. L. 89-10

TITLE I

NEW MEXICO

Submitted by:
Mildred Fitzpatrick, Chairman
Title I, ESEA Services
Department of Education
Capitol Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

Prepared by:
Isaac Garcia, Specialist
Jesse Manzanares, Specialist
Program Development (Evaluation)
Title I ESEA Services
Department of Education
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501

TITLE I, ESEA SERVICES

LEONARD J. DE LAYO
SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

MILDRED FITZPATRICK
CHAIRMAN, TITLE I, ESEA SERVICES AREA

STATE OF NEW MEXICO

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

CAPITOL BUILDING

SANTA FE

A. J. GARDE, COORDINATOR,
PROGRAM OPERATION (FINANCE)

PAUL SIMPSON, SPECIALIST,
PROGRAM OPERATION

ISAAC GARCIA, SPECIALIST,
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT (EVALUATION)

BILL CAPERTON, DIRECTOR,
MIGRANT PROGRAM

JOE P. REEDER, AUDITOR

December 1, 1967

TO: Mr. John F. Hughes, Director
Division of Compensatory Education
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education
Office of Education
Department of Health, Education & Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20202

FROM: Mildred Fitzpatrick, Chairman
Title I, ESEA Services

SUBJ: State Annual Evaluation Report for Fiscal Year 1967 for P.L. 89-10, Title I Projects

Herein is contained the New Mexico "State Annual Evaluation Report" for P.L. 89-10, Title I Projects.

The pages that follow are a comprehensive analysis of Title I activity carried out in the eighty-eight public school districts in New Mexico who are receiving funds under P.L. 89-10, Title I. One local educational agency, Los Alamos, although eligible for these funds, chose not to participate in the provisions of this program.

Each item is a direct response to identically numbered items in "Instructions for State Annual Evaluation Report, Title I, ESEA" fiscal year, 1967.

STATE SUMMARY

OF

TITLE 1, ESEA

FOR

FISCAL YEAR 1967

TITLE I, ESEA SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

NEW MEXICO ALLOCATION FOR 1966-67

	No. of Eligible Children	Amount Per Child	Amount Allocated
Allocated to the local educational agencies for the operation of regular Title I, ESEA programs (includes low-income, AFDC, Neglected, and those in Foster Homes)	45,737	$ 210.54	$ 9,629,504.
Allocated to State Institutions for Handicapped children	700	210.54	147,456.
Allocated to State Institutions for Delinquent children	402	56.99	22,908.
Allocated to State Department of Education - Migrant children.	963	132.95	128,035.
State Administration	(47,802)	2.07	99,279.
TOTALS: 1966-1967	47,802	N/A	$10,027,182.

TITLE I, ESEA SERVICES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

1967 FISCAL YEAR

SCHOOL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE CHILDREN	APPROVED ALLOCATION
Alamogordo	611	$ 128,639.
Albuquerque	7,426	1,563,475.
Animas	29	6,105.
Artesia	618	130,113.
Aztec	221	46,529.
Belen	584	122,955.
Bernalillo	1,196	251,805.
Bloomfield	545	114,744.
Capitan	81	17,053.
Carlsbad	1,131	238,122.
Carrizozo	99	21,843.
Causey	19	4,000.
Central	2,148	452,237.
Chama Valley	493	103,796.
Chaves County	229	49,502.
Cimarron	95	20,001.
Clayton	224	47,161.
Cloudcroft	57	12,001.
Clovis	817	172,011.
Cobre	481	101,269.
Corona	57	12,000.
Cuba	507	106,745.
Deming	539	113,481.
Des Moines	25	5,263.
Dexter	156	33,471.
Dora	21	4,421.
Dulce	105	22,106.
Elida	21	$ 4,421.
Encino	66	13,896.
Espanola	2,230	469,504.
Estancia	171	36,755.
Eunice	94	19,790.
Farmington	667	140,433.
Floyd	32	6,737.
Fort Sumner	177	37,265.
Gadsden	668	140,640.
Gallup	3,080	648,465.
Grady	44	9,263.
Grants	992	208,857.
Hagerman	60	13,354.
Hatch Valley	243	51,161.
Hobbs	610	128,430.
Hondo Valley	103	21,685.
House	32	6,737.
Jal	26	2,650.
Jemez Mountain	254	53,479.
Jemez Springs	277	58,319.
Lake Arthur	45	9,474.
Las Cruces	1,643	348,619.
Las Vegas City	804	172,526.
West Las Vegas	1,608	338,548.
Logan	45	9,613.

SCHOOL DISTRICT	NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE CHILDREN	APPROVED ALLOCATION
Lordsburg	92	$ 19,369.
Los Alamos	65	-0-
Los Lunas	365	76,847.
Loving	98	20,632.
Lovington	523	110,112.
Magdalena	311	65,477.
Maxwell	46	9,684.
Melrose	47	9,895.
Mora	590	124,219.
Moriarty	69	14,527.
Mosquero	59	12,421.
Mountainair	238	50,108.
Ojo Caliente	275	57,898.
Pecos	422	90,047.
Penasco	652	137,272.
Pojoaque	457	97,063.
Portales	570	120,007.
Quemado	74	15,579.
Questa	409	86,110.
Raton	424	89,269.
Reserve	101	21,264.
Roswell	1,061	226,382.
Roy	59	12,421.
Ruidoso	44	9,263.
San Jon	43	9,053.
Santa Fe	1,740	366,341.
Santa Rosa	453	95,374.
Silver City	255	53,621.
Socorro	626	131,798.
Springer	173	36,423.
Taos	1,418	$ 298,547.
Tatum	56	11,790.
Texico	91	19,159.
T or C	229	49,313.
Tucumcari	524	110,322.
Tularosa	264	55,582.
Vaughn	94	19,791.
Wagon Mound	214	45,055.
TOTALS	45,737	$ 9,629,504.

SCHOOLS FOR HANDICAPPED

Los Lunas Hospital & Training School	345	$ 72,674.
N.M. School for Deaf	214	45,080.
N.M. Sch. for Visually Handicapped	141	29,702.
TOTALS	700	$ 147,456.

INSTITUTIONS FOR DELINQUENTS

Girls'Welfare Home	107	$ 6,111.
N.M. Boys' School	295	16,797.
TOTALS	402	$ 22,908.

MAJOR ACHIEVEMENT

Communicative Arts: Seventy-five of the eighty-eight school districts have provided special programs in the communicative arts in areas of Cultural Enrichment, English Language Arts, English as a Second Language, Remedial Reading, and Foreign Language. This is perhaps our most significant achievement and has provided the largest effort in serving the needs of our multi-cultural student population. Gains in educational attainment, as indicated by local evaluation reports, have shown this area to have benefitted the largest number of students at all grade levels.

Libraries and library services throughout the state have been vastly improved as a result of Title I, ESEA. The purchase of resource material, the addition of professional and non-professional personnel, have been accomplished by projects in thirty-two local school districts. Particular impact has been noted in the small rural schools that are now able to provide adequate library service to the children of their schools.

In-Service and Pre-Service Training: A major achievement under Title I, ESEA funding has been the extensive In-Service and Pre-Service training that has become available to teachers of our disadvantaged children. Workshops, university consultants, special institutes and curriculum conferences have proved to be of major value to our children, teachers and schools.

Health - Food Programs: Extensive health-food services were initiated by seventy local educational agencies. The general health and attitude of needy children have been greatly increased by the action of these programs. Children, whose educational attainment has always been hindered as a result of poor health, inadequate food and clothing, have been elevated by Title I, ESEA, 729,129 free meals; 1,341 physical examinations; 3,389 eye examinations; 2,560 dental examinations; and 861 pairs of eye glasses were provided for these needy children during the past school year.

Guidance and Counseling Service: Professional guidance and counseling services in forty-six New Mexico schools have been initiated or expanded as a result of Title I. The major contribution has been the addition of desperately needed services in rural schools. Eighty-four professional personnel, plus additional non-professional assistants, have been provided to upgrade and increase the guidance and counseling services, offering vitally needed supportive assistance to instructional and service areas.

DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES AND METHODS

A. SEA Services to LEA's: Each of the eligible local educational agencies was visited one or more times by Title I staff members to observe implementation of projects, ensure operation was consistent with project activity as approved, and to provide technical assistance

in the areas of project evaluation, project implementation, project development, and dissemination of information. Eleven workshops were conducted in centrally located areas to discuss development, implementation, and evaluation of Title I projects. In addition, SEA staff members attended all budget hearings at which time further assistance was provided to local personnel. The close contact we have maintained with local educational leaders has been the major influence in the successful operation of the Title I program in New Mexico. Members of the SEA Title I staff are available to offer any type of consultative service to the local agencies upon request.

B. Most Pressing Educational Needs: Local educational agencies individually determine the priority needs of disadvantaged students in their schools and submit Title I projects to alleviate the deficiencies caused by this educational deprivation. It is our assumption that local educational leaders are most familiar with local situations and are in the best position to determine the needs of children in their schools. Based upon the number of projects written and approved in the various areas, and considering the amount of funds budgeted for these areas, the priority needs of children in New Mexico are as follows:

1. Communicative Arts
   - Cultural Enrichment
   - Remedial Reading
   - English Language Arts
   - Teaching English as a Second Language
   - Teaching Foreign Language
   - Library Services

2. Health-Food Services

3. Vocational Education

4. Guidance and Counseling Services

5. Pre-School Instruction

C. Most Prevalent Project Objectives: In an attempt to reduce the educational deficiencies of our disadvantaged students, and after having identified and ranked the priority needs of these students, local superintendents listed the following objectives in rank order:

1. Code 12 - To improve classroom performance in reading beyond usual expectations;

2. Code 22 - To improve children's verbal functioning;

3. Code 51 - To improve the physical health of the children;

4. Code 11 - To improve performance as measured by standardized achievement tests;

5. Code 33 - To raise their occupational and/or educational aspiration levels.

The most effective approaches used to reach the above objectives include:

Code 12 - Provision of Communicative Arts programs in Cultural Enrichment, Remedial Reading, English Language Arts, Teaching English as a Second Language, Teaching Foreign Language, Individual Instruction and Library Services;

Code 22 - Same areas as Code 12;

Code 51 - Provision of extensive health-food programs on an individual basis;

Code 11 - Provision of general remedial programs in Language Arts, English, Individualized Instruction, and other academic areas;

Code 33 - Provision of extensive Pre-school Instruction, expanded Guidance Services, Physical Education and Recreational Programs, and Individualized Instruction.

D. Title I Activities and Those of Other Federal Programs:

Title I funds have been used extensively to supplement other programs financed by federal funds from other sources and, in turn, federal funds from other federal sources have been used to supplement Title I programs. There are a large variety of federal programs available to our local educational agencies and local educational leaders find the competition and overlapping of responsibility in some areas, a major source of concern. Many of these programs should be consolidated in an effort to avoid duplication paperwork and the need to constantly search for programs that can be funded from federal sources.

1. ESEA, TITLE II

Thirty-two local projects have combined Title I and Title II funds to provide new or expanded library services. Generally, Title I funds are used to supplement Title II funds in the purchase of library materials, and in addition, to provide professional and non-professional personnel to staff these libraries.

2. ESEA, TITLE III

Albuquerque	Educational Service Center provides services to twenty-five LEA's and the non-public schools in these districts.
Cobre	"A Cooperative Project to Provide Supplemental Services to a Group of Elementary and Secondary Schools" serves six LEA's and the non-public schools within these districts.

Raton	"Developing Creative Awareness Through Stronger Programs in Dramatics" includes as participants six LEA's and the non-public schools.
Clovis	"Special Service Center" includes three public schools and one non-public school.
Hobbs	"LEA County Data Processing Center" includes five public schools and one non-public school.

3. ESEA, TITLE IV

The Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory has provided a degree of service to Title I schools throughout the State of New Mexico. Notably, workshops and conferences dealing with various educational areas (for example: major emphasis being placed in the area of English as a Second Language), have been provided by this agency.

4. ESEA, TITLE V

Most notable contribution Title V has provided is the addition of staff to the State Department of Education which, in turn, is providing valuable assistance to local educational agencies throughout the State. Legal services, services of a Library Specialist, and the expansion of the publications division have all assisted in the operation of Title I.

5. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOOD PROGRAM

This program in New Mexico is administered by the State Welfare Department, Consumer and Marketing Service. It has provided New Mexico schools with agricultural commodities; distribution is based upon the number of children participating in the hot lunch

program. Title I funds have provided food service programs in fifty-seven schools receiving this commodity assistance.

6. COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY

Eleven Head Start programs were jointly funded, utilizing OEC and Title I funds to complement and supplement each other in expanding programs reaching a larger number of needy pre-school children.

7. NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

Twenty-one NYC programs were established in communities throughout New Mexico. There have been no cooperative projects in this area, although many of the programs are administered by the local educational agency and the services of many of these workers were utilized in Title I projects available to this organization.

E. Staff Development and Utilization: The most effective activities undertaken to develop and utilize staff by the local and state educational agencies are as follows:

A. State Educational Agency

1. Use of State Department of Education Specialists to assist in planning, developing and evaluating programs;

2. The SEA sponsored a statewide "Conference on Education of the Disadvantaged" which included lectures and demonstrations by nationally known university personnel;

3. University consultants have been utilized to assist in planning, developing, and evaluating programs.

B. Local Educational Agencies

1. In-Service programs are carried out in many of the Title I project area schools. These programs feature university consultants who have worked with local districts and are providing special In-Service training sessions in Reading, Language Arts, and Mathematics. These programs have been particularly successful in upgrading the level of Reading, Language Arts, and Mathematics instruction in the project area schools.

2. Special summer institutes providing In-Service training to teachers who are involved in special projects have been held by several schools. These summer institutes feature an intensive course of university study at one of the teacher'education institutions.

3. Local, area and statewide workshops have been conducted by individual schools, and by Department of Education personnel. These workshops have been held in every instructional and service area and feature new and modern approaches that have come about as a result of Title I,ESEA.

4. Interchanges of personnel between schools and school districts have taken place in many districts. Teachers have been sent to observe and study projects that are being successfully operated. An attempt then is made to initiate similar programs at their respective schools.

F. Involvement of Non-Public School Children: (1) As reported by local educational agencies, the most effective Title I activities involving non-public school children are as follows:

a) English Language Arts Programs;
b) Remedial Reading Programs;
c) Food-Health Service Programs;
d) Guidance Programs;
e) Cultural Enrichment Programs.

New Mexico has been a leader in providing Title I programs for non-public school children. Statewide and local conferences have been held with public and non-public school personnel invited to discuss and plan cooperative Title I programs. An outstanding atmosphere of cooperation has resulted from these conferences; this is evidenced by the excellent programs currently in operation as joint projects. (2) The most commonly funded programs involving non-public school children include:

a) English Language Arts Programs;
b) Remedial Reading Programs;
c) Food-Health Service Programs;
d) Guidance Programs;
e) Cultural Enrichment Programs.

Another common activity within the above-mentioned programs is the loan of audio-visual material and equipment to the non-public schools. Non-public schools in New Mexico have generally suffered more than the public schools from lack of modern technological instructional devices. To an astounding extent, Title I has alleviated this problem for both public and non-public schools.

Innovative and/or Exemplary Projects: Many of the projects involving non-public school children can be classified as innovative and/or exemplary. Title I has brought about a first in education by bringing the public and non-public schools together in joint efforts to attack the same objective. The following are brief outlines of such programs.

Raton, New Mexico	Parochial school students travel three blocks each day to receive physical education training from a qualified instructor hired by a local junior high school. Classes are held on the public school facilities and are an extension of a Title I project existing in the public school.
Taos, New Mexico	Parochial school students have arranged classes so that they may leave the parochial school each day and attend home economics or science (electricity) courses taught in the regular public school program. Twenty-two new typewriters are also on loan to the parochial school so that the business education department can expand and enrich their business education program.
Las Vegas, New Mexico	Parochial school children in the village of Villaneuva walk several blocks each day to take part in the public school hot lunch program. The cafeteria program was expanded to include service for the parochial school students. Many of the needy parochial school students are provided with free meals.
Tucumcari, New Mexico	Public school teachers travel to the parochial stchool each day and provide Language Arts and Reading courses for students enrolled in the parochial school.
Bloomfield, New Mexico	Numerous items of instructional equipment and supplies, including recreational equipment, have been loaned to an Indian mission school. The services of guidance counselors are also being provided the Indian children attending the private school.

G. Programs Designed for Handicapped Children: (1) The State Educational Agency has encouraged and prompted LEA-operated activities for handicapped children in low-income areas. This is evidenced by the

fact that seventeen LEA's have budgeted a total of $442,000 for special programs designed to meet the special educational needs of handicapped students in public schools and non-public schools. Specifically, the SEA has provided the following:

a) Conducted statewide and local conferences dealing with the problems and solutions to problems of education for handicapped children;

b) Director of Special Education at the State Department of Education has been consulted by the Title I staff and local agency personnel in planning and developing programs for these handicapped children.

(2) The most effective activities designed and conducted by LEA's for educationally deprived handicapped children are as follows:

a) Established special education classes by hiring special education teachers and classroom aides;

b) Constructed special education classrooms in one district and provided rent payments for classroom space in another district;

c) Provided for consultant services to study and develop programs for educationally handicapped children;

d) Provided extensive In-Service training for special education teachers;

e) Provided for extensive purchase of supplies and equipment necessary to initiate and carry out special education instruction.

PROBLEMS RESOLVED

A. The successful administration of the ESEA Title I program for the past fiscal year presented no major problems in terms of either state or local participation. Definite problems do exist in the framework of the program and they are discussed below.

B. A major problem which the state and local educational agencies have little or no control over, and which if resolved, would bring about a large increase in the efficiency of administration as well as an increase in the effectiveness of programs, is the present method of funding. Until the very last minute, school people have been uncertain as to the amount of money their school districts will receive. Effective planning has virtually become an unrealistic and impossible task. We have a majority of school districts in New Mexico who receive allocations of between $5,000 and $35,000. The uncertainty of several thousand dollars which may or may not become available to them creates insurmountable problems in planning effective programs. The answer to the problem presented by the funding patterns of the past years is simple. Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, and the U.S. O.E. must realize that the effectiveness of these programs is being undermined from the very beginning. Early appropriations and early notification of exact allocations are a must if the intended efficiency and effectiveness of Title I is to be achieved.

# # # #

STATEWIDE TABULAR DATA

TITLE I, ESEA

FOR

FISCAL YEAR 1967

TABLE 1 AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE AND AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP RATES FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED WITH ALL OTHER PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE STATE

GRADE	1965 - 1966						1966 - 1967					
	Title I Schools				All Other Public Schools		Title I Schools				All Other Public Schools	
	ALL		1/3 or More Participants[1]				ALL		1/3 or More Participants[1]			
	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM	ADA	ADM
12th	14517	15060	2354	2414	335	346	14849	15453	2400	2517	275	280
11th	16326	16956	2603	2706	385	400	16425	17103	2687	2810	341	349
10th	17768	18402	2867	2976	420	433	18649	19360	3146	3284	382	389
9th	19123	19738	3233	3342	472	482	19922	20571	3300	3415	361	371
8th	19703	20293	3224	3332	452	468	20430	21040	3492	3596	381	391
7th	20983	21568	3553	3617	473	484	21256	21835	3642	3744	387	395
6th	21240	21812	3519	3624	485	499	21036	21551	3544	3690	387	396
5th	21447	22023	3487	3595	489	502	21556	22087	3634	3786	396	406
4th	21997	22558	3640	3742	474	489	22572	23111	3836	3939	376	385
3rd	23036	23577	3746	3833	503	517	22663	23187	3973	4057	380	389
2nd	23523	24130	3890	4000	489	501	23598	24159	4013	4106	409	419
1st	28098	28891	5349	5520	583	596	28342	29105	5512	5733	438	448
TOTAL ADA	247761		41465		5560		251298		43179		4513	
TOTAL ADM		255008		42701		5717		258562		44677		4618
TOTAL ENROLL.	258,431		43,446		5,766		261,434		45,250		4,633	

1/ Those Schools in which 1/3 or more of the student enrollment participated in Title I programs.

DROPOUT RATES (HOLDING POWER) FOR TITLE I PROJECT SCHOOLS COMPARED

WITH ALL OTHER PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE STATE

	1966-67																	
	Title I Schools						Non-Title I Schools						1/3 or More Participants 1/					
Grade	7	8	9	10	11	12	7	8	9	10	11	12	7	8	9	10	11	12
Total No. Of Students	15874	15251	15603	13044	11161	10280	5768	5696	5436	3107	2920	2573	3046	3055	2995	2561	2185	1926
No. Of Drop-Outs	242	295	569	1124	1021	684	10	5	37	64	53	42	106	100	169	182	171	109
No. Of Schools	91	92	90	81	82	82	20	19	19	7	7	7	23	24	23	25	25	25
Drop-Out (%) Rate	1.5	1.9	3.6	8.6	9.1	6.7	.02	.08	.7	2.1	1.8	1.6	3.5	3.3	5.6	7.1	7.8	5.7

NOTE: 1/ Drop-out data for prior years not available

TABLE 3B

Grade 1

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST-TESTS

Test and Subsection	Mo. & Yr. Tested	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score S.D. (σ)2/	No. of Students Scoring, According to Nat'l Norm: 25th %-ile and below	26th to 50th %-ile	51st to 75th %-ile	76th %-ile and above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Metropolitan Achievement Test Reading	4-66	B	765	Information not available		209 (27%)	210 (27%)	164 (21%)	182 (24%)
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
Metropolitan Achievement Test Reading	4-67	A	689	Information not available		109 (16%)	188 (27%)	160 (23%)	232 (34%)

1/ List those groups which took pre- and/or post tests, including students in the groups who were tested only once during the project period.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

TABLE 3B

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

Grade 9th

GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST-TESTS

Test and Subsection	No. & Yr. Tested	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score S.D. (σ)2/	No. of Students Scoring, According to Nat'l Norm: 25th %-ile and Below	26th to 50th %-ile	51st to 75th %-ile	76th %-ile and Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
ITED General Vocabulary	10-66	X	575	26.04	11.500	301 (52%)	133 (23%)	95 (17%)	46 (8%)
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
ITED General Vocabulary	10-67	Y	603	26.13	10.86	301 (50%)	152 (25%)	112 (19%)	38 (6%)

1/ List those groups which took pre- and/or post tests, including students in the groups who were tested only once during the project period.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

TABLE 3B

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

Grade 9

GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST-TESTS

Test and Subsection	Mo. & Yr. Tested	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score S.D. (σ)2/	No. of Students Scoring, According to Nat'l Norm: 25th %-ile and Below	26th to 50th %-ile	51st to 75th %-ile	76th %-ile and Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
ITED Composite Score	10-66	X	560	163.85	47.793	231 (41%)	191 (34%)	89 (16%)	49 (9%)
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
ITED Composite Score	10-67	Y	589	162.26	44.916	240 (40%)	207 (35.1%)	103 (17.4%)	39 (6.6%)

1/ List those groups which took pre- and/or post tests, including students in the groups who were tested only once during the project period.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

TABLE 3A

Grade 11th

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

STUDENTS TAKING BOTH PRE AND POST-TESTS

Test and Subsection	Mo. & Yr. Tested	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score S.D. (σ) 2/	No. of Students Scoring, According to Nat'l Norm: 25th %-ile and Below	26th to 50th %-ile	51st to 75th %-ile	76th %-ile and Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
ITED Composite Score	9-66	X-4 C-P	265	12.60	11.90	129 (49%)	71 (27%)	39 (15%)	26 (9%)
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
ITED Composite Score	Mo. & Yr. Tested: 4-67	X-4 C-P	265	13.90	14.20	111 (42%)	65 (25%)	41 (15%)	48 (18%)

1/ Include here only students, within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre- and post-tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

TABLE 3B

Grade 11th

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST-TESTS

Test and Subsection	No. & Yr. Tested	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score S.D. (σ)2/	No. of Students Scoring, According to Nat'l Norm: 25th %-ile and Below	26th to 50th %-ile	51st to 75th %-ile	76th %-ile and Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
ITED Composite Score	10-66	X	761	194.697	64.012	276 (36%)	221 (29%)	175 (23%)	89 (12%)
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
ITED Composite Score	11-67	Y	431	155.162	63.196	149 (35%)	135 (31%)	96 (22%)	51 (12%)

1/ List those groups which took pre- and/or post-tests, including students in the groups who were tested only once during the project period.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

TABLE 3B

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

Grade 11

GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST-TESTS

Test and Subsection	No. & Yr. Tested	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score S.D. (σ) 2/	No. of Students Scoring According to Nat'l Norm: 25th %-ile and Below	26th to 50th %-ile	51st to 75th %-ile	76th %-ile and Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
ITED General Vocabulary	10-66	X	791	34.179	14.759	295 (37%)	244 (31%)	140 (18%)	112 (14%)
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
ITED General Vocabulary	11-67	Y	446	33.838	14.554	173 (36%)	144 (30%)	65 (13%)	64 (13%)

1/ List those groups which took pre- and/or post tests, including students in the groups who were tested only once during the project period.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

TABLE 3B

Grade 2nd

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST-TESTS

Test and Subsection	No. & Yr. Tested	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score S.D. (σ)2/	No. of Students Scoring, According to Nat'l Norm: 25th %-ile and Below	26th to 50th %-ile	51st to 75th %-ile	76th %-ile and Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
SRA Reading									
Comprehension	10-66	Blue	1504	9.504	5.819	673 (45%)	494 (33%)	23[illegible] (16%)	98 (6%)
Vocabulary	10-66	Blue	1480	12.586	6.812	579 (39%)	426 (29%)	372 (25%)	113 (7%)
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
SRA Reading									
Comprehension	5-67	Blue	1557	13.218	5.738	527 (34%)	457 (29%)	399 (26%)	174 (11%)
Vocabulary	5-67	Blue	1553	20.130	7.368	547 (35%)	420 (27%)	401 (26%)	185 (12%)

1/ List those groups which took pre- and/or post tests, including students in the groups who were tested only once during the project period.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

TABLE 3B

Grade 3rd

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST-TESTS

Test and Subsection	No. & Yr. Tested	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score S.D. (σ) 2/	No. of Students Scoring, According to Nat'l Norm: 25th %-ile and Below	26th to 50th %-ile	51st to 75th %-ile	76th %-ile and Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
SRA Reading Comprehension	10-66	Blue	1510	15.31	6.676	543 (36%)	472 (31%)	303 (20%)	192 (13%)
Vocabulary	10-66	Blue	1401	24.38	7.337	501 (34%)	555 (37%)	227 (15%)	208 (14%)
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
SRA Reading Comprehension	5-67	Blue	1340	17.38	6.184	435 (32%)	410 (31%)	256 (19%)	248 (18%)
Vocabulary	5-67	Blue	1347	26.38	7.139	478 (36%)	480 (36%)	179 (13%)	210 (15%)

1/ List those groups which took pre- and/or post tests, including students in the groups who were tested only once during the project period.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

TABLE 33

Grade 4th

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST-TESTS

Test and Subsection	No. & Yr. Tested	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score S.D. (σ) 2/	No. of Students Scoring, According to Nat'l Norm: 25th %-ile and Below	26th to 50th %-ile	51st to 75th %-ile	76th %-ile and Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
SRA Total Reading	Jan., 1966	Blue	2,325	24.94	11.00	793 (34%)	928 (39%)	371 (15%)	233 (10%)
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
SRA Total Reading	Jan., 1967	Blue	3,387	25.58	[illegible]	[illegible] (30%)	1,422 (41%)	545 (16%)	378 (11%)

1/ List those groups which took pre- and/or post tests, including students in the groups who were tested only once during the project period.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

TABLE 3B

Grade 6

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST-TESTS

Test and Subsection	No. & Yr. Tested	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score S.D. (σ)2/	No. of Students Scoring, According to Nat'l Norm: 25th %-ile and Below	26th to 50th %-ile	51st to 75th %-ile	76th %-ile and Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
SRA Reading	9-66	Blue	2,575	37.615	15.887	1,190 (46%)	691 (27%)	444 (17%)	250 (10%)
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
SRA Reading	5-67	Blue	1,044	44.210	17.233	446 (43%)	276 (26%)	195 (19%)	124 (12%)

1/ List those groups which took pre- and/or post tests, including students in the groups who were tested only once during the project period.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

TABLE 3B

Grade 8th

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

GROUPS TAKING PRE AND/OR POST-TESTS

Test and Subsection	No. & Yr. Tested	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score S.D. (σ) 2/	No. of Students Scoring, According to Nat'l Norm: 25th %-ile and Below	26th to 50th %-ile	51st to 75th %-ile	76th %-ile and Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
SRA Total Reading	10-66	Blue	583	39.35	14.746	445 (76%)	104 (18%)	31 (5%)	3 (.5%)
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
SRA Total Reading	11-67	Blue	807	47.64	17.794	475 (59%)	165 (20%)	119 (15%)	48 (6%)

1/ List those groups which took pre- and/or post tests, including students in the groups who were tested only once during the project period.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

TABLE 3A

Grade 10th

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67
STUDENTS TAKING BOTH PRE AND POST-TESTS

Test and Subsection	No. & Yr. Tested	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score S.D. (σ) 2/	No. of Students Scoring, According to Nat'l Norm: 25th %-ile and Below	26th to 50th %-ile	51st to 75th %-ile	76th %-ile and Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
SRA Diagnostic Reading	10-66	B	65	54.50	4.50	16 (25%)	22 (34%)	12 (18%)	15 (23%)
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
SRA Diagnostic Reading	5-67	A	65	60.30	1.30	9(14%)	23 (35%)	13 (20%)	20 (31%)

1/ Include here only students, within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre- and post-tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

TABLE 34

Grade 11th

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

STUDENTS TAKING BOTH PRE AND POST-TESTS

PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS

Test and Subsection	No. & Yr. Tested	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score S.D. (σ) 2/	No. of Students Scoring, According to Nat'l Norm: 25th %-ile and Below	26th to 50th %-ile	51st to 75th %-ile	76th %-ile and Above
SRA Diagnostic Reading	10-66	B	43	51.5	14.50	21 (49%)	8 (19%)	9 (21%)	5 (12%)

POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS

	No. & Yr. Tested								
SRA Diagnostic Reading	5-67	A	43	57.5	8.50	18 (42%)	6 (14%)	12 (28%)	7 (16%)

1/ Include here only students, within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre- and post-tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

TABLE 3A

Grade 12

STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS, TITLE I (ESEA) 1966-67

STUDENTS TAKING BOTH PRE AND POST-TESTS

Test and Subsection	No. & Yr. Tested	Form	Number of Students 1/	Raw Score Mean 2/	Raw Score S.D. (σ) 2/	No. of Students Scoring, According to Nat'l Norm: 25th %-ile and Below	26th to 50th %-ile	51st to 75th %-ile	76th %-ile and Above
PRE-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
SRA Diagnostic Reading	10-66	B	61	61.3	7.7	25 (41%)	15 (25%)	10 (16%)	11 (18%)
POST-TEST SCORE RESULTS									
SRA Diagnostic Reading	5-67	A	61	64.8	4.2	19 (31%)	14 (23%)	12 (20%)	16 (26%)

1/ Include here only students, within the group, who continued through the project and were present to take both pre- and post-tests. The number of students who took the pre-test on this chart will be the same as the number who took the post-test.

2/ If not raw score, indicate type score reported for each test.

SEA Table 4

TABLE 6 - 3
STUDENTS IN TITLE I PROJECT HIGH SCHOOLS CONTINUING EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL COMPARED WITH STATE NORM

	1965-1966			1966-1967		
	Title I Schools		All Other Public Schools	Title I Schools		All Other Public Schools
	All	1/3 or More Participants 1/		All	1/3 or More Participants 1/	
Total Number of Graduates	11,080	1,764	2,280	11,340	1,788	2,376
Number of Schools	87	27	5	88	27	5
Mean Size of Graduating Class	127.35	68.44	456	128.55	63.11	475.20
Number of People Continuing Education 2/	5,185	697	1,617	5,825	875	1,567

1/ Those schools in which 1/3 or more of the students enrollment participated in Title I programs.

2/ A student is considered to continue his education if he enters one of the following, on either a full or part-time basis: Post-Graduate High School Course, Junior College, College or University, Vocational, Commercial or Technical Institute, or Nursing School.